

ORIGINALDecision No. 41566

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Investigation into)
 the rates, rules, regulations, charges,)
 allowances and practices of all common)
 carriers, highway carriers and city)
 carriers relating to the transportation)
 of property.)

Case No. 4808

Appearances

W. S. Lair and T. A. E. Loretz, for petitioner
A. H. Cawood, in propria persona, interested party

(The above are appearances in the instant proceeding. For additional appearances, see previous decisions in this case.)

SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION

This opinion deals with proposed revisions in minimum rates, rules and regulations established for the transportation of hay by highway carriers. The proposed revisions were submitted by the Hay Truckers Association, Inc., a non-profit corporation of approximately 150 highway carriers principally engaged in the transportation of hay.

Public hearing on the proposal was had before Examiner Abernathy at Los Angeles on April 8, 1948.

The rates herein involved are those applicable to the transportation of hay to the area designated in the tariff as the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory.¹ Petitioner association alleges that the minimum rates to this territory are insufficient and not related to the

¹ The minimum rates, rules, and regulations in question are set forth in Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 (Appendix "D" to Decision No. 31606, as amended, in Case No. 4246). The tariff provides both distance rates applicable between points in California generally, and point-to-point rates from defined producing areas to consuming areas.

rates which must be charged to sustain the transportation service. It states that during the recent war period the carriers assessed higher rates which had been established by the Office of Price Administration as maximum rates. Since then such rates have generally prevailed as "going" rates. However, because of increases in recent years in costs of labor, equipment, repair parts, tires, insurance, fuel and other operating expenses, the "going" rates themselves have become inadequate. Due to the fact that competition amongst themselves for the available traffic is keen, the carriers have not been able to increase their rates as operating costs increased. As a result a number are discontinuing operations because of inability to meet the expenses of operation. Petitioner alleges that the financial instability of the carriers acts to their disadvantage in another way. Because of a need for cash to carry on their day-to-day operations and to meet fixed charges, they are not able to bargain effectively with shippers for sufficient rates. Instead they are being compelled more and more to accept what rates the shipper will pay, although such rates may be less than those generally recognized as "going" rates. Petitioner asserts that an increase by the Commission in the minimum rates is the only avenue by which the carriers can obtain adequate revenues to maintain their services.

Evidence in support of the petition was submitted by various members of the association. The carriers described the transportation of hay as being a specialized operation requiring extra large vehicles because of the bulky nature of the commodity. Hay is brought from the growers to the yards of dealers in the Los Angeles-Hynes area; there it is graded and frequently held on the vehicles for periods varying from a few hours to as long as two weeks awaiting reconsignment to dairies and to other ultimate consumers. For the delay to their equipment and for the redelivery, the carriers assert-

edly collect no additional compensation. They stated that hay is practically the only commodity they transport and that their trucks move empty on their trips from the hay-consuming to the hay-producing areas except in a small percentage of instances when they transport other commodities as a "back-haul." They said that the movement of hay is concentrated in the spring and summer months with relatively little transportation being performed during the fall and winter. During the latter seasons much of their equipment remains idle.

Referring to the financial results of their operations, the carriers testified that their revenues have fallen far short of returning a reasonable profit. A public accountant called by petitioner submitted and explained exhibits covering a financial analysis which he had made for the year 1947 of the operations of 18 member-carriers of the association. He said that the operating experience of these carriers is typical of that of other carriers engaged in the transportation of hay. According to the exhibits, the gross revenues for the year of 15 of the 18 carriers were less than \$10,000 each. Of the remaining three carriers, the gross revenues of two were less than \$15,000 each, and the revenues of the third were \$31,500. In every case the indicated gross operating expenses after allowances of compensation to the carrier-owner himself for his personal services exceeded the operating revenues. Operating losses ranging from \$233 to \$3,950 are listed. Average gross revenues for the group are shown as \$9,692, operating expenses as \$11,628, and the average net loss, \$1,936. In addition to presenting data to reflect the financial results of the carriers' operations, the accountant also developed cost figures per mile which he modified to include provisions for profit and anticipated increases in future operating expenses.

Other witnesses called by petitioner included dealers in trucks, auto parts and supplies, and an insurance representative.

These witnesses testified that in their opinion the hay carriers are in urgent need of additional revenues. They said that in their dealings with the carriers they are experiencing increasing difficulties in effecting collections for sales heretofore made on a credit basis; that a number of the carriers have not been able to meet their obligations and that the dealers have consequently had to repossess equipment in some cases and in other cases they have had to charge off to loss sums of several thousands of dollars. They also said that they have generally had to withdraw credit privileges from the hay carriers and to require them to pay cash for any supplies.

The secretary-manager of petitioner association introduced exhibits setting forth the proposed minimum rates, rules and regulations which had been developed in light of the accountant's studies and which also gave effect to present practices of the carriers and of the hay industry. The proposed rates are compared with the present minimum rates and the "going" rates in the margin below.² In addition to proposing higher minimum rates for the transportation of hay, the witness requested that increases be made in the minimum carload weights, that rules and charges be provided to govern reconsignment of shipments, that a rate allowance be made for direct

2

As set forth in exhibits of record the various rates in cents per 100 pounds for the transportation of hay to the Los Angeles-Hynes territory from the hay-producing territories are indicated below:

<u>From Territory</u>	<u>Present Minimum Rates as set forth in Item No. 058-C, Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2.</u>	<u>Present "Going" Rates</u>	<u>Proposed Minimum Rates</u>
Bakersfield	19	25-1/2	29
Coachella Valley	17	23-3/4	27
Fresno Territory	25	33-1/2	38
Imperial Valley	20	28-3/4	-
(East)	-		35
(West)	-		33
Lancaster	14	20-1/2	23
Merced	30	34-3/4	40
Salton Sea	19	28-3/4	33
Tulare	20	30-3/4	35
Palo Verde Valley	-	30-1/4	35

delivery to ultimate consignees, and that specific rates be established for the unloading and delivery of hay from rail cars. These latter proposals are discussed in detail hereinafter. In his testimony the witness emphasized that the hay carriers are currently in a "deplorable" financial condition, and he stressed that they are in urgent need for additional revenue.

A dealer in hay whose place of business is located in the Los Angeles-Hynes territory testified generally in opposition to petitioner's proposals. This witness thought that the proposed rules and additional charges would be difficult to apply and would not be enforceable if the minimum rates are increased as requested. He believed that it might be difficult to pass the higher charges on to the dairymen and other consumers. He stated that 1947 was an unprofitable year for both the hay dealers and the hay carriers, and that over that period his own firm lost approximately \$10,000. The witness testified that in the course of his business he employs a number of carriers to transport hay from the producing areas and that he also uses equipment of his own. The services of the carriers are also used to some extent for the transportation of items such as fertilizer to the farms and ranches. He said that for the transportation of hay from the Imperial Valley area he is paying the carriers at the rate of \$5 per ton instead of the "going" rate of \$5.75 per ton. He declared that the \$5 rate enables efficient carriers to "break even" or to earn some profit. The asserted sufficiency of the \$5 rate he also attributed to the fact that the carriers with whom he deals are furnished with loads as "back-hauls."³

³ The witness said that he had not had time to compile figures to show the cost of transporting hay by his own equipment. He said also that other hay dealers in the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory had not had opportunity to present evidence because of relatively short notice. A request made by the witness at the close of the hearing for a two week's continuance was denied by the examiner for the reason that the requested time was excessive under the circumstances disclosed during the hearing. Further hearings in this proceeding may be scheduled upon filing of appropriate petitions therefor by interested parties.

A transportation engineer of the Commission's staff submitted a report of a study he had made of the costs of transporting baled hay to the Los Angeles territory from the various hay-producing territories involved in this proceeding. Data for this study had been taken principally from the records of 18 of the carriers.⁴ The engineer explained that he had interviewed in excess of 60 carriers, but due to the insufficiency of their records he had not been able to obtain satisfactory figures from other than the number indicated. In his study the engineer undertook to develop the costs of transporting hay by the types of vehicles which the carriers use.⁵ He said that in arriving at his estimated costs he had modified the carriers' figures to allow for somewhat greater usage and somewhat heavier loading of the vehicles than the carriers have experienced. He explained that these modifications had been made to determine costs which in his opinion would be experienced in performing an efficient transportation service.

The financial data submitted in evidence by petitioner in this proceeding clearly show that the earnings of the carriers who transport hay to the Los Angeles-Hynes territory are insufficient. It appears, however, that the deficiencies of the carriers' earnings can be attributed to operating practices as well as to rates. The volume of the carriers' revenues undoubtedly is restricted by their practice of specializing almost wholly in the transportation of hay.

4

The record does not indicate whether the carriers' records which were analyzed by the engineer were the same as those upon which the accountant witness based his studies.

5

The engineer's cost figures included an allowance for profit based upon an operating ratio of 95 per cent.

This practice results in the curtailment of services during several months of each year. Correspondingly, the service of transporting hay over a 7 or 8-month period of each year is burdened with the carriers' expenses for the entire year. Were the carriers to transport other commodities when hay is not available for shipment, such transportation would normally share some of the expense now charged to hay. The failure of the carriers to obtain "back-hauls" undoubtedly works to similar effect. Although it was indicated that the equipment used by the carriers is not altogether suited to the transportation of other commodities, the record does not show, and it is not reasonable to assume, that the vehicles themselves are so specialized in nature as to preclude their being used, within reasonable limits, for other purposes than transporting hay. In the absence of a clear showing of justification, minimum rates should not be established at a level which will maintain on a year-to-year basis carriers whose services are restricted to the transportation of one commodity and are performed over a period substantially less than a year. The delays to the carriers' equipment at the hay dealers' yards pending reconsignment of shipments also are partly responsible for the carriers' low earnings, since the carriers are not compensated for such delays and are deprived of their vehicles during those periods. The practice of the carriers of making further delivery without charge of shipments which have been reconsigned by the dealers apparently is also a contributory factor to their low earnings. In view of the effect of these various factors upon the earnings of the carriers, it is concluded that their revenue and expense figures, and cost figures developed therefrom by the accountant, do not provide a wholly acceptable basis for adjusting the present minimum rates.

The cost figures of the Commission engineer provide a more suitable basis for an adjustment in the minimum rates than do those

of petitioner. Although the data for the engineer's study were also derived from the records of the carriers, his figures, as has been hereinbefore indicated, include modifications to arrive at estimated costs of an efficient transportation service. Clearly, the efficiency of a carrier, or group of carriers, is an element to be considered in the proper establishment of minimum rates. The engineer's figures show that the present minimum rates between the hay-producing and hay-consuming territories involved herein are relatively low. His figures, projected to show transportation costs for various distances, generally correspond to rates said to be the "going" rates. We conclude, therefore, that for the transportation of hay to the Los Angeles-Hynes territory from the hay-producing territories heretofore listed, the minimum rates should be increased to conform generally to the "going" rates.

In connection with petitioner's remaining proposals it was urged that recognition be given to prevailing customs in the hay industry, particularly with respect to the practice of shipping hay to dealers and subsequently reconsigning it to other consignees for ultimate delivery. It was indicated that this practice has been observed over a number of years, and that it facilitates the marketing of hay. In requesting that recognition be given to this custom, petitioner also requested that charges be established for services which the carriers have hitherto performed free. Petitioner proposes that when vehicles are detained for reconsignment purposes in excess of 48 hours a demurrage charge of \$20 per 24-hour period, or fraction thereof, be established. Also, it proposes that a delivery charge be assessed when shipments are not reconsigned within the

⁶ The minimum rates, rules and regulations currently applicable to the transportation of hay do not specifically provide for reconsignment of shipments.

48-hour free-time period; moreover, it requests that free delivery of reconsigned shipments within the Los Angeles-Hynes area be limited to 15 miles from point of reconsignment and that a charge be assessed for deliveries beyond 15 miles. The demurrage charge and rule requested by petitioner appear reasonable and will be adopted much as proposed. The reasonableness of the provisions relating to reconsignment of shipments was not established, however.⁷ Nevertheless, the evidence clearly shows a need for provisions to govern reconsigned shipments. Consideration being given to the cost figures developed by the Commission engineer, we conclude that a charge of 2½ cents per 100 pounds should be established for the reconsignment and delivery of shipments of hay within the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory. Our order which follows will so provide.

Petitioner requested that an allowance of one cent per 100 pounds be made from the established rates when shipments are delivered directly from consignor to consignee. It was explained that the purpose of the proposal was to give recognition to lesser transportation costs of, and to encourage, direct delivery of shipments. Since the diversion charge to be provided herein reflects higher costs of handling reconsigned shipments, the allowance itself does not appear necessary for the purposes indicated and will not be established.

The proposal that the present minimum carload weights of 20,000 pounds be increased to 26,000 pounds for tractor-and-semi-

⁷ It was not shown that the costs of delivery of reconsigned shipments are so different after the expiration of the free-time period as to justify the proposed delivery charge. Establishment of charges for deliveries beyond 15 miles from point of reconsignment would break down such uniformity of rates as the carriers have hitherto observed in the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory. Moreover, the additional charges would be difficult to compute or verify, since they would be dependent upon the carriers' choices of routes in making delivery.

trailer equipment and to 36,000 pounds for truck-and-trailer equipment appears reasonable and will be adopted. The evidence indicates that the average loads of the carriers transporting hay to the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory exceed the proposed weights. The higher weight minima should tend to promote more efficient loading of the vehicles. Also will be adopted the proposal to provide point-to-point rates for the transportation of hay from Blythe and vicinity. It appears that this area is developing into a major hay-producing territory. A requested amendment of the tariff provisions relating to the Imperial Valley Territory to result in higher rates from the eastern part of that area will not be made. It was alleged that mileage differentials justify the division of the present territory into two zones and the establishment of higher rates from the eastern zone. However, petitioner did not specifically undertake to show how its mileage figures were derived or that they fairly represent mileage differences between the two parts of the territory. Moreover, it did not show that establishment of higher rates from the eastern zone would not unreasonably discriminate against the growers of hay in that zone.

Petitioner requested that a minimum rate of $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds be established for the combined services of unloading rail carloads of hay and making delivery within a radius of 60 miles. The proposed rate assertedly corresponds with the "going" rate for these services. It was explained that a purpose of the proposal is to prevent the breaking-down of the point-to-point rates by combinations of the distance rates with the railroad rates for the transportation of hay. Evidence submitted to justify this proposal was based principally upon the experience of two carriers operating in the vicinity of Bellflower. The proposal as set forth would apply statewide. It would not be appropriate to make an adjustment in the

statewide rates upon the basis of the limited evidence which was offered. However, it appears that an adjustment affecting only the rates in or to the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory would be proper. The record is clear that the revenues earned by the carriers in this area for transporting hay from rail cars under the distance rates are insufficient to return the costs of performing the service when the distances over which the transportation is performed are small. The propriety of the proposed rate was not sufficiently established to justify its adoption for the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory. However, in view of the evidence which was submitted by petitioner's witnesses and by the Commission engineer relating to loading, unloading, and other of the costs of handling and delivering hay, we conclude that the distance rates should be made subject to a minimum charge of \$20 per shipment in order to result in revenues which will correspond more reasonably with the costs of making deliveries from rail cars to points within the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory. Such a charge will be established.

Upon careful consideration of all the evidence herein, the Commission is of the opinion and finds that Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 should be further amended as shown in the revised pages attached to and made a part of the order which follows, and that in all other respects Decision No. 31606, supra, as amended, should remain in full force and effect.

O R D E R

An adjourned public hearing having been held in the above-entitled proceeding and based upon all of the evidence and upon the conclusions and findings contained in the preceding opinion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2, Appendix "D" to Decision No. 31606, in Case No. 4246, as amended, be and it is hereby further amended by incorporating the revised and

new pages attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof to become effective June 6, 1948, which pages are numbered as follows:

Third Revised Page 35 Cancels Second Revised Page 35
Second Revised Page 35-A Cancels First Revised Page 35-A
Fifth Revised Page 51-1 Cancels Fourth Revised Page 51-1
Original Page 51-J.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that tariff publication required to be made by common carriers as a result of the amendments hereof of the afresaid tariff shall be made effective on not less than five (5) days' notice to the Commission and to the public.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that in all other respects the petition of the May Truckers' Association, Inc. referred to in the preceding opinion be and it is hereby denied.

In all other respects said Decision No. 31606, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty (20) days from the date hereof.

Dated at Los Angeles, California, this 4th day of May, 1948.

P. J. Anderson
Justus F. Calmes
Leah H. Howell
Harold P. Kula
Benjamin Potter
Commissioners

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
-271-B Cancels 271-A	<p style="text-align: center;">TERRITORIAL DESCRIPTIONS (Continued) (Items Nos. 270 and 271 series)</p> <p>The following territorial descriptions apply in connection with rates making specific reference hereto: (territories include both sides of streets, boulevards, roads, avenues or highways named)</p> <p>1. BAKERSFIELD TERRITORY includes that area lying within the following boundaries: Commencing at a point 10 miles east of U.S. Highway No. 99 on the Kern County-Tulare County Boundary Line; thence southeasterly along an imaginary line paralleling U.S. Highway No. 99 to its intersection with State Highway No. 178; thence southerly along said imaginary line to its intersection with U.S. Highway No. 466 and County Road 1.7 miles east of Edison; thence southerly along said County Road to its intersection with County Road north of Arvin; thence westerly along said County Road through Weedpatch to its junction with U.S. Highway No. 99; thence southerly along U.S. Highway No. 99 to its junction with State Highway No. 166; thence westerly along State Highway No. 166 to its junction with U.S. Highway No. 399 at Maricopa; thence northwesterly along U.S. Highway No. 399 to Taft; thence northwesterly along State Highway No. 33 to its intersection with U.S. Highway No. 466 at Blackwells Corner; thence easterly along U.S. Highway No. 466 to its junction with County Road 6.2 miles east of Lost Hills; thence northerly along said County Road to its intersection with the Kern County-Kings County Boundary Line; thence easterly along the Kern County Boundary Line to point of beginning.</p> <p>2. COACHELLA VALLEY TERRITORY includes that area lying between the little San Bernardino Mountains and Cottonwood Mountain on the one hand, and the San Jacinto and Santa Rosa Mountains on the other; and bounded on the northwest by Edom on U.S. Highway No. 99 and Indian Wells on State Highway No. 111, and on the southeast by the Riverside-Imperial County Line on U.S. Highway No. 99 and Southern Pacific Company station of Mortmar on State Highway No. 111.</p> <p>3. FRESNO TERRITORY includes that area lying within the following boundaries: Commencing at the point the Fresno-Kings County boundary line meets the Monterey County boundary line; thence north-easterly along the southerly boundary line of Fresno County to its intersection with southwesterly boundary of Sierra National Forest approximately three miles east of Miramonte; northwesterly along the southwesterly boundary of Sierra National Forest to its intersection with the northerly boundary of Madera County; thence southwesterly along the northerly boundary line of Madera County, and southwesterly and southerly along the northwesterly and westerly boundary line of Fresno County to point of beginning.</p> <p>4. IMPERIAL VALLEY TERRITORY includes that area bounded on the south by the International Boundary Line; on the east by the East High Line Canal to the point at which it intersects the main line of the Southern Pacific four miles east of Niland; on the north by the main line (transcontinental route) of Southern Pacific Company; and on the west by a series of imaginary lines drawn from Southern Pacific station of Wister to Kane Springs on U.S. Highway No. 99; thence south to Plaster City on U.S. Highway No. 80; thence south to the International Boundary Line.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Continued)</p>
* Change, Decision No. <u>41556</u>	
EFFECTIVE JUNE 6, 1948	
Issued by The Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, Correction No. 331 San Francisco, California.	

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
<p>*271-B Cancels 271-A (Con- cluded)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">TERRITORIAL DESCRIPTIONS (Concluded) (Items Nos. 270 and 271 series)</p> <p>5. LANCASTER TERRITORY includes that area lying within the following boundaries: Commencing at a point 10 miles east of Mojave on U.S. Highway No. 466; thence southerly along an imaginary line paralleling State Highway No. 7, passing through Redman to Littlerock; northwesterly along State Highway No. 138 from Littlerock through Palmdale and Elizabeth Lake to its intersection with the Los Angeles Aqueduct, northeasterly along the Los Angeles Aqueduct to its intersection with U.S. Highway No. 466, thence southeasterly along U.S. Highway No. 466 to point of beginning.</p> <p>6. LOS ANGELES-HYNES TERRITORY includes that area embraced by the following: Commencing at the point where State Highway No. 27 (Topanga Canyon Road) meets the Pacific Ocean; thence northerly along said highway through Girard until it intersects Los Angeles City Boundary Line approximately two miles north of Chatsworth; thence northeasterly following said boundary line until it meets the southern boundary of the Angeles National Forest at a point approximately two miles west of Olive View Sanitarium; thence easterly following said Angeles National Forest boundary until it intersects State Highway No. 39 (San Gabriel Forest Highway) north of Azusa; thence southerly on said Highway No. 39 (variously called Azusa Avenue, Glendora Avenue, La Habra Road, and Huntington Beach Boulevard) and passing through Puente and Buena Park to its meeting with the Pacific Ocean at Gamewell 1.6 miles southeast of Huntington Beach; thence northwesterly following the coast line to point of beginning.</p> <p>7. MERCED TERRITORY includes that area lying wholly within the County of Merced.</p> <p>(1)7½. PALO VERDE TERRITORY includes that area within California lying within a radius of 25 miles of Lovelock Boulevard and Hobson Way, Blythe.</p> <p>8. SALTON SEA TERRITORY includes that area lying directly between the Coachella and Imperial valleys, as these latter are defined above.</p> <p>9. SAN DIEGO TERRITORY includes that area embraced by the following imaginary line starting at the northerly junction of U.S. Highways 101E and 101W (4 miles north of La Jolla); thence easterly to Miramar on State Highway No. 395; thence southeasterly to Lakeside on the El Cajon-Ramona Highway; thence southerly to Bostonia on U.S. Highway No. 80; thence southeasterly to Jamul on State Highway No. 94; thence due south to the International Boundary Line, west to the Pacific Ocean and north along the coast to point of beginning.</p> <p>10. TULARE TERRITORY includes that area lying within the following boundaries: Commencing at the point of intersection of the Kings, Monterey and San Luis Obispo County boundary lines; thence easterly along the southerly boundary of Kings and Tulare Counties to its intersection with the westerly boundary line of Sequoia National Forest; northerly along the latter boundary line to its intersection with the westerly boundary of Sequoia National Park; northerly and westerly along the westerly boundary line of Sequoia National Park to its intersection with State Highway No. 198; southwesterly along State Highway No. 198 to County Road approximately one mile north of Lemon Cove; westerly along said County Road through Woodlake to junction of said County Road with State Highway No. 65; northerly along State Highway No. 65 to point of intersection with northerly boundary of Tulare County; thence westerly, southwesterly and southerly along the northerly boundaries of Tulare and Kings Counties and westerly boundary of Kings County to point of beginning.</p>

* Change
(1) New Territory } Decision No. 41566

EFFECTIVE JUNE 6, 1948

Issued by The Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
Correction No. 332 San Francisco, California.

-35-A-

RATES AND CHARGES ON THIS PAGE ARE NOT SUBJECT TO INCREASES PROVIDED IN SUPPLEMENT NO. 6

Fifth Revised Page ... 51-I
Cancels

Fourth Revised Page ... 51-I

HIGHWAY CARRIERS' TARIFF NO. 2

Item No.	SECTION NO. 3		COMMODITY RATES (Continued)			
			In Cents per 100 Pounds			
	HAY AND RELATED ARTICLES, viz.:					
	Fodder, bean, cane, corn or pea, Hay,		Leaves, cactus, dried, Straw.			
	See Item No. 271 series for description of territories.					
	FROM	TO Los Angeles-Hynes Territory		TO San Diego Territory		
		RATES (See Note 1)				
		Any Quantity △	Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds (See Note 2)	Any Quantity △	Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds △	
*658-D Cancels 658-C	Bakersfield Territory	(1)64	◇ (1)26	--	--	
	Coachella Valley Territory	61	◇ 24	73	20	
	Fresno Territory	(1)78	◇ (1)33	--	--	
	Imperial Valley Territory	73	◇ 30	64	18	
	Lancaster Territory	(1)53	◇ (1)20	--	--	
	Merced Territory	(1)87	◇ (1)35	--	--	
	*Palo Verde Territory	--	◇ (1)31	--	--	
	Salton Sea Territory	66	◇ 27	73	20	
	Tulare Territory	(1)73	◇ (1)30	--	--	

(1) Rates apply only for transportation of Hay.

NOTE 1.- (a) Rates include services of driver and one helper to perform loading, unloading or other accessorial services.

(b) Rates do not alternate with rates provided in Item No. 657 series or Section No. 2 of this tariff.

(c) Rates are not subject to the provisions of Items Nos. 110, 150, 160, 170, 220 or 230 series.

(d) When baled hay or any other commodity described in this item is picked up from several points in a single field, the point of origin of the composite shipment shall be deemed to be the point of pickup most distant from point of destination. An additional charge of 2 cents per 100 pounds shall be assessed for picking up and loading baled hay from scattered points in the field.

(e) (Applicable to shipments to points within the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory only.) When a shipment has been tendered for delivery at destination, and is subsequently reconsigned to any point within the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory without being unloaded from carrier's equipment, a charge of 2½ cents per 100 pounds shall be assessed for delivery of the reconsigned shipment.

(f) (Applicable to shipments to points within the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory only.) When a shipment has been tendered for delivery at destination, and is subsequently held for reconsignment without being unloaded from carrier's equipment, 48 hours free time (computed from the first 7:00 A.M. after time of tender) will be allowed for furnishing reconsignment instructions to the carrier. A charge of \$20.00 shall be assessed for each 24-hour period, or fraction thereof, that the carrier's equipment is detained subsequent to the free-time period specified herein. In computing time in accordance with these provisions, Sundays and legal holidays shall be excluded. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to shipments which are reconsigned to points outside of the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory.

◇(g) (Applicable to shipments to points within the Los Angeles-Hynes Territory only.) Rates in Item No. 657 series which are subject to a minimum weight of 20,000 pounds shall be also subject to a minimum charge of \$20.00 when the point of origin of a shipment is a railroad team track or established depot, or when such rates are combined with railroad common carrier rates to produce through rates in accordance with the provisions of Item No. 210 series.

◇ NOTE 2.-Shipments moving by tractor and semi-trailer are subject to a minimum weight of 26,000 pounds. Shipments moving by truck and trailer are subject to a minimum weight of 36,000 pounds.

◇ Increase)
◊ Reduction) Decision No. **41566**
* Change)

△ Change, Neither Increase Nor Reduction

Item No. 659A formerly shown on Fourth Revised Page 51-I transferred to Original Page 51-J.

EFFECTIVE JUNE 6, 1948

Issued by The Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.
Correction No. 333

RATES ON THIS PAGE ARE NOT SUBJECT TO INCREASES PROVIDED IN SUPPLEMENT NO. 6

Original Page ... 51-J

HIGHWAY CARRIERS' TARIFF NO. 2

Item No.	SECTION NO. 3		COMMODITY RATES (Continued) In Cents per 100 Pounds	
	COMMODITY	FROM	TO	RATES △
*659-B Cancels 659-A	Ice Minimum weight 30,000 pounds.	Porterville Tulare Visalia Exeter	Delano	6 6 7 7½
<p>△ Change, Neither Increase Nor Reduction</p> <p>* Change, Decision No. <u>41566</u></p> <p>For rates in effect prior to the effective date shown hereon, see Fourth Revised Page 51-I.</p>				
EFFECTIVE JUNE 6, 1948				
<p>Issued by The Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, Correction No. 334. San Francisco, California.</p>				